

REMARKS

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 3 and 53 to recite that at least one LDD region is not overlapping the gate electrode of the pixel TFT.

Applicants will now address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1 and 25

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1 and 25 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of Shimone and Adan et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, Kobayashi appears to disclose a pixel TFT (10) with two LDD regions not overlapping a gate electrode (14) and an n-type TFT (20) with two LDD regions not overlapping a gate electrode (24). Hence, TFT (10) and TFT (20) appear to have the same structure. In the Office Action, the Examiner contends that the TFT in Adan should be substituted into the structure in Kobayashi. Adan, however, discloses in Fig. 29, a LDD region (71) partially overlapping a gate electrode (66). Hence, a hypothetical combination of Kobayashi and Adan would have both the pixel TFT and the n-type TFT comprising the LDD region partially overlapping the gate electrode.

In contrast, independent Claim 1 of the present application recites that the n-channel TFT has at least one LDD region partly overlapping a gate electrode of the n-channel TFT while the pixel TFT has at least one LDD region not overlapping the gate electrode of the pixel TFT. There is no

disclosure or suggestion in either of the cited references of such a structure, even if the Examiner's proposed combination of references is proper (which Applicants do not admit).

Hence, for at least the above-stated reasons, independent Claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon, are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection now be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 21, 23 and 27

The Examiner also rejects Claims 3, 21, 23 and 27 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of Shimone, Hiroki, and Adan et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons discussed above for independent Claim 1, independent Claim 3 and those claims dependent thereon are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection also be withdrawn.

Claim 53

The Examiner also rejects Claim 53 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of Shimone, Takasu, Adan and Matsumoto. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons discussed above for independent Claim 1, independent Claim 53 is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection also be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are also submitting an IDS herewith. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner consider this IDS prior to issuing any further action on this application.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

Please charge our deposit account 50/1039 for any further fee for this amendment.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

June 3, 2004



Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO, CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street; Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500